

## **REMARKS**

### **STATEMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP**

The present application, Serial No. 09/286,099, and US Patent No. 6,269,335 to Ittycheriah were, at the time the invention of the Application Serial No. 09/286,099 was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to International Business Machines Corporation.

### **RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claim rejections are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

#### **Claim Rejections - § 103**

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,995,930 to Hab-Umbach in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,335 to Ittycheriah, as set forth in pages 2-3 of the Office Action.

However, Ittycheriah does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(1). For example, MPEP 706.02(l)(1) states that “[s]ubject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

While Applicants do not concede that Ittycheriah qualifies as prior art under 102(e), the Examiner’s 103 arguments appear to be based on the assumption that Ittycheriah qualifies as prior art only under 102(e) because Ittycheriah was filed on August 14, 1998, a date before Applicant’s filing date of April 2, 1999, and issued on July 31, 2001, a date after Applicant’s filing date.

However, as stated above, the application and Ittycheriah, at the time the invention was made, were subject to an obligation of assignment to the IBM Corporation. Thus, Ittycheriah does not qualify as 102(e) prior art.

Further, Hab-Umbach, by itself, does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 9, and 15. For example, at the very least, Hab-Umbach does not disclose or suggest, *generating a synthetic waveform for each of N text sequences representing the N-best hypotheses output from a speech recognition system*, as recited in claims 1 and 9 and further does not disclose or suggest, *a waveform generator for generating a synthetic waveform for each of the N text sequences*, as recited in claim 15. For example, the Examiner concedes (in paragraph 2 of the Office Action), that Hab-Umbach does not teach “generating a synthetic waveform for each of the N-best sequences”.

Moreover, Hab-Umbach, by itself, does not disclose or suggest claims 2-8, 10-14, and 16-22, at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 9, and 15.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of Hab-Umbach and Ittycheriah cannot render obvious claims 1-22.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Robert Newman  
Robert Newman  
Reg. No. 60,718  
Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, NY 11797  
Telephone: (516) 692-8888  
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889